

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*

Applicants have read and understood the Action, and thank Examiner Ramos for the careful consideration reflected therein. The various grounds are summarized and responded to below, and Applicants respectfully urge favorable reconsideration of the claims in view of these remarks.

Claim 14 was objected to because it depends on the cancelled claim 1. This is a clerical error that has been resolved by appropriate amendment. Claim 8 is the only pending claim having the elements that are referenced in claim 14, making claim 8 the clear parent claim, not claim 1.

Claims 8-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brunner (US 5,031,534) in view of Soler et al. (US 2003/0030828). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brunner in view of Soler, further in view of Fujimori (US 6,181,892). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brunner and Soler, further in view of Dolezalek et al. (4,901,254). Because claim 8 is the sole pending independent claim, the remainder of these remarks will focus on the patentability of this claim, with the understanding that the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Referring to the "Response to Arguments" set forth in Action, it is respectfully submitted that this material reflects a misunderstanding of the claims. In particular, although the Action alleges at this point that the argued limitations are not actually present in the claims, Applicants hope to convince the Examiner that the noted limitations are indeed exactly what is already set forth in the claims.

To assist in this explanation, the following table matches the allegedly missing limitations with the express limitations of claim 8:

Distinction discussed in previous response	Express wording of claim 8
"...specific colors are measured <i>one by one</i> ..."	...executing separately <i>one after the other</i> for individual process colors involved in an autotype combination printing...
"...while changing the ink feed of <i>only that</i>	...changing <i>only the color supply of a single</i>

<i>color."</i>	<i>process color</i> ; determining the effect of the change in the color supply of this one process color on color values of a color spot to be measured...
"The controlling of all colors together takes place only after this crucial stage, when the <i>data of the single color variations are compared ...</i> "	<i>...balancing all of the measurement values determined and stored in step (a) with each other ...</i>
"...and the colors may be <i>controlled in combination</i> due to mapped similarities"	... so that for further color correction, <i>a few or all of the process colors</i> involved in the printing <i>can be adjusted simultaneously</i> .

Based on the above chart, it is respectfully submitted that the "Response to Arguments" section reflects a misunderstanding of the express claim language. Moreover, this misunderstanding apparently lead the Examiner to erroneously disregard Applicant's remarks. Given that the previously submitted remarks were wholly tied to the claim language, as expressly demonstrated above, Applicants again request consideration of the previously submitted remarks.

To avoid confusion, Applicants not only incorporate the prior response by reference, but also repeat those arguments hereinafter, substituting the express claim language for the simplified language of the prior response:

The purpose and effect of the present invention can be summarized as follows. Initially it determines "the effect of the change in the color supply of ... one process color on color values of a color spot to be measured." This can be done by "changing only the color supply of a single process color," this being done "separately one after the other for individual process colors" and "determining the effect of the change in the color supply of this one process color on color values of a color spot to be measured."

After this behavior measurement, "all of the measurement values determined and stored" are balanced. After the measurements are "balanced," the ink feeds can be controlled in combination to achieve a desired effect while printing all colors during a print run, i.e. "a few or all of the process colors involved in the printing can be adjusted *simultaneously*."

On the other hand, Bruner teaches one to find correlations between data from measurement in solid color fields and dotted or screened fields (see Abstract). In dotted or screened color fields, there is a "dot gain" while printing, so that the dots can increase as printing proceeds. From this and other data, the ink feeds are controlled. This does not relate to the invention of the present application wherein ink feeding is controlled by a specific method wherein specific colors are measured one by one while changing the ink feed of only that color. The controlling of all colors together ("...few or all of the process colors ... can be adjusted *simultaneously*." ) takes place only after this crucial stage (printing each color separately, see above), when the data of the single color variations are compared (balanced) and the colors may be controlled in combination (few or all simultaneously) due to mapped similarities (balancing).

With respect to Soler, this reference teaches to print samples in variations of a given color so that a user can pick the best color match from amongst these samples. There is, in this process, no data similar to that gathered in the instant invention. For example, the Soler user does not find data for a difference of color when the ink feed is changed. This process is not usable in printing presses. In the instant invention, each single color is measured in relation to variation of ink feed ("executing separately one after the other for individual process colors ... changing only the color supply of a single process color; determining the effect of the change...") so that comparable data are achieved. In this way, the color changes are comparable and it can be determined which ink feeds may be controlled in combination (few or all simultaneously).

Fujimori teaches the use of different toner color images superimposed on different color image bearing members and so checking the superimposed color matching. Alternatively, this can be done by printing each color without superimposing the different colors. There is, in Fujimori no teaching or suggestion to check single colors to determine which colors can be controlled in combination.

With respect to Sullivan, this reference teaches a halftoning method to create a binary image from a continuous tone color image. This is wholly unrelated to the present invention. In the present invention, there is no need to gather binary data from the image. Rather, the data from the individual color tests are processed to determine which colors can be controlled in combination during a print run.

Thus, given the distinctions over the art, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are patentable over the cited art, whether taken singly or in combination. It is further submitted that those of skill in the art would not desire to combine the references because of the vast differences in the structure and operation of the various disclosed systems as discussed above.

*Conclusion*

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Phillip M. Pippenger, Reg. No. 46,055  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: January 26, 2009